

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-10, 12, 13, 15, 17-19, 21-28, and 30-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Yoneda et al. (US 2001/0026127).

Claims 3, 14, 20, and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoneda et al. in view of Shirasaki et al. (US 5,834,894).

Claims 5, 16, and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoneda et al. in view of Okamoto et al. (US 5,543,685).

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoneda et al. in view of Kanai et al. (US 6,121,727).

The Drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(5).

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants have amended the Specification to correct a minor informality, and amended claims 1, 5, 12, 16, 28, 27, and 32-34 to further define the invention. Accordingly, claims 1-34 are pending for further consideration.

Drawing Objection

The Drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(5). Specifically, FIG. 3 includes a reference character “57” that is not described in the Specification. Accordingly, Applicants have amended paragraph [0008] of the Specification to include, in part, “an insulating layer 57.” Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that the Drawings include reference characters that are completely described in the Specification, and

respectfully request that the objection to the Drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(5) be withdrawn.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-10, 12, 13, 15, 17-19, 21-28, and 30-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Yoneda et al. (US 2001/0026127), claims 3, 14, 20, and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoneda et al. in view of Shirasaki et al. (US 5,834,894), claims 5, 16, and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoneda et al. in view of Okamoto et al. (US 5,543,685), and claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoneda et al. in view of Kanai et al. (US 6,121,727). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections on grounds that none of the applied references, whether taken singly or combined, teach or suggest the combination of features recited by amended independent claims 1, 12, 18, 27, and 32-34.

Independent claims 1, 12, 18, 27, and 32-34 all recite “a planarization layer encapsulating end portions of the color filter layer and the black matrix.” In contrast to Applicants’ claimed invention and as admitted by the Office Action, Yoneda et al. fails to describe a planarization layer between a first electrode and a color filter layer. Accordingly, the Office Action relies upon Okamoto et al. for allegedly teaching the use of a planarization layer in order to protect the electrodes and color filters. However, Applicants respectfully assert that Okamoto et al. merely teaches forming a protective film 3 formed covering color filter layers R, G, and B, and thus fails to teach or suggest “a planarization layer encapsulating end portions of the color filter layer and the black matrix,” as required by amended

independent claims 1, 12, 18, 27, and 32-34, and hence dependent claims 2-11, 13-17, 19-26, and 28-31. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that Okamoto et al. fails to remedy the deficiencies of Yoneda et al. in order to arrive at Applicants' presently-claimed invention.

In addition, Applicants respectfully assert that Shirasaki et al. and/or Kanai et al., whether taken singly or combined with Okamoto et al., can remedy the deficiencies of Yoneda et al. Specifically, neither Shirasaki et al. nor Kanai et al., whether taken singly or combined with Yoneda et al. and/or Okamoto et al., teach or suggest "a planarization layer encapsulating end portions of the color filter layer and the black matrix," as required by amended independent claims 1, 12, 18, 27, and 32-34, and hence dependent claims 2-11, 13-17, 19-26, and 28-31.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 1-34 are neither taught nor suggested by the applied prior art references, whether taken alone or in combination. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103(a) should be withdrawn because the above-discussed novel combination of features are neither taught nor suggested by any of the applied references.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner believe that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: _____



David B. Hardy
Reg. No. 47,362

Date: July 5, 2005

Customer No. 09629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: 202-739-3000